UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,491	07/07/2003	Bryan Loomas	BRONNE00600	8889
74059 Broncus Techn	7590 12/27/2007 ologies, Inc. c/o		EXAM	INER
Levine Bagade Han LLP			VRETTAKOS, PETER J	
Palo Alto, CA	ore Road Suite 100 94303		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			3739	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

			0
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	-0
	10/615,491	LOOMAS ET AL.	·
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peter J. Vrettakos	3739	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address	ş
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ID.  Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply but will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fitte, cause the application to become ABANDO	ION. e timely filed from the mailing date of this communioned (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11-	<u>1-07</u> .		
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) Thi	is action is non-final.	•	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	ance except for formal matters,	prosecution as to the mer	its is
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1,3-23,44 and 46-66 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrays 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected.  7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ⊠ Claim(s) 1,3-23,44 and 46-66 are subject to respect to the subject to the subject to the subject to respect to the subject to the s	awn from consideration.	ement.	
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	cepted or b) objected to by the	ne Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority document</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority document</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	nts have been received.  Its have been received in Applic ority documents have been received.	cation No eived in this National Stag	e
Attachment(s)	<b></b>		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)		

10/615,491 Art Unit: 3739

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1 and 3-23, drawn to a method for creating an airway connecting to outside the body, classified in class 128, subclass 898.
- II. Claims 44 and 46-66, drawn to a method for creating an airway connecting to the lung parenchyma, classified in class 128, subclass 898.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed can have different designs. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required

Application/Control Number:

10/615,491 Art Unit: 3739

because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A telephone call was made to Sanjay Bagade on 12-17-07 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

10/615,491

Art Unit: 3739

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J. Vrettakos whose telephone number is 571-272-4775. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda C. Dvorak can be reached on 571-272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Pete Vrettakos December 17, 2007

ROY D/GIBSON

VD. Sibson